

**APFO Committee
City of Rockville
July 6 Meeting Notes - FINAL**

Committee Members present: Jason Anthony, Dennis Cain, Tom Gibney, Eric Siegel, Roald Schrack, Julie Palakovich-Carr.

Committee Members absent: Sean Hart

City Staff present: Jim Wasilak

Meeting convened at 7:05pm. Charles Littlefield and Soo Lee-Cho arrived after the meeting started.

Purpose of meeting was to continue ongoing discussions on committee members views of material presented/obtained to date, as well as what process and framework the Committee will use to arrive at its final recommendations for the Planning Commission.

Roald began by presenting further analysis of the student generation rates provided by MCPS on June 23. He will prepare a report that sets forth his findings in a narrative fashion rather than as a statistical matrix. He determined that an outlier of the data in zone 7 (King Farm), which he will explain a possible rationale for in the report.

Julie will prepare written testimonial to present to the Planning Commission on July 13, which will address the information we have received to date, the process we have followed and will highlight that we will aim to provide more detailed information and recommendations by August 3.

A list of outstanding action items from the June 29 meeting was given so that we can complete our data gathering work.

We then discussed MCPS data to determine whether to recommend to MCPS or Montgomery Planning to create an appropriate formula to predict student generation rates. The discussion turned to pointing out deficiencies and outliers to those agencies so that those outliers can be assessed and integrated into the model. Roald discussed his study of growth rates and the impact on generation rates for a particular school. The group determined that there were too many factors that vary from school to school and apartment building to apartment building to formulate any conclusions. We discussed what can be properly recommended, if anything, in view of our charge as a committee. It was suggested by one of the committee members that in the spirit of transparency, the data should be placed online for the public to view and analyze.

It was highlighted that midrise buildings will likely be the predominant type of development in Rockville for the future, so Rockville or the development community should consider approaching the county to address generation rates for this building type to keep pace with population growth and actual student generation rates. In short, there is a need to re-check student generation rates to better accommodate new developments. The best this committee can do is point out problems we have uncovered from the data received and leave it to the Planning Commission or City Council to act based on those findings, if they wish to do so.

There was discussion about process in terms of reporting out what we have learned, recommendations from that data, if appropriate, or no recommendations if we cannot make any based on specific data received. We can point out analyses and deficiencies in data collection.

The group then discussed the APFO and APFS in light of the Rockville Pike Plan. There was discussion about whether, like White Flint Sector Plan or Science City, the Pike Plan should be phased such that

infrastructure improvements would be achieved before the next phase proceeds. In the context of this discussions, the group highlighted certain aspects of the data and information presented by the Montgomery County Planning Department the previous week.

There was a brief discussion about a facilities fee to address infrastructure needs in Rockville. Julie raised the concept that Rockville already has imposed stormwater management fees for off-site mitigation of stormwater, in which citizens and Rockville property owners pay into a fund which is earmarked for stormwater management projects. It was suggested that this model could also be applied to handle traffic mitigation issues on a citywide basis, rather than piecemeal.

Lastly, the group discussed how to move forward to discuss the APFO and APFS, flagging issues, what we have learned to flesh out those issues, whether recommendations can be made regarding those specific issues or whether any conclusions emerge, and what standards, if any, require modification or should remain unchanged.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35pm.